

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Application

Prior to entry of this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5, 8-13, 16-19, 21, and 23-25 were pending for examination. A final Office Action mailed June 9, 2009 rejected claims 1-3, 5, 8-13, 16-19, 21, and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,717,593 to Jennings (hereinafter "Jennings"), U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0104068 of Barrett et al. (hereinafter "Barrett"), *Compilers: Principles, Techniques, and Tools* by Aho et al. (hereinafter "Aho"), and U.S. Patent No. 5,933,140 to Strahorn et al. (hereinafter "Strahorn").

This amendment amends claims 1 and 19, but does not add or cancel any claims. Hence, after entry of this amendment, claims 1-3, 5, 8-13, 16-19, 21, and 23-25 will stand pending for examination. Claims 1 and 19 are independent claims. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims, for at least the reasons presented below.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "outputting, from the parser computer program to a context-based help utility, information about position and content the at least one graphical element identified by parsing the tokens in the web-based application," (emphasis indicates amendments). Claim 19 has been amended in similar fashion. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the application, including specifically on page 3.

Claim 19 has been further amended change the verb tense of the term "output" to conform with the remainder of that claim.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection – Claims 1-3, 5, 8-13, 16-19, 21, and 23-25

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-3, 5, 8-13, 16-19, 21, and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jennings, in view of Barrett, in view of Aho. It is

respectfully submitted that the claims, at least as amended, are allowable over any combination of Jennings, Barrett, and/or Aho.

Claims 1 and 19

Claim 1, for example, has been amended to recite, inter alia, "outputting, from the parser computer program to a context-based help utility, information about position and content of the at least one graphical element identified by parsing the tokens in the web-based application." The final Office Action takes the position that column 4, lines 38-42 of Strahorn teaches the output of information corresponding to graphical elements.

Strahorn, however, specifically discloses that a help program 312 downloads help information from a web server 102 "specific to the selection selected," and updates a help information section 324 of the web page if new information is available (presumably from the server). See Strahorn, col. 4, lines 38-42. In other words, Strahorn merely discloses downloading context-specific help information from a web server, based on the selection of a section of a web page for which help is desired. This disclosure contemplates that the help information has already been developed at the server, and has nothing to do with outputting information from a parser computer program that is also used to scan a DOM to generate tokens and also to parse those tokens to identify at least one graphical element.

Claim 1, on the other hand, requires that the parser computer program output information about position and content of a graphical element that has been identified by the parser program from tokens generated by the parser computer program by scanning the DOM of a web-based application. Even assuming (without conceding) that the web server of Strahorn provided the same information as that output by the parser computer program of claim 1, the process of outputting the information from a parser computer program and merely serving it from a web server is materially different. In fact, the method of claim 1 could be used to generate the information served by Strahorn's web server, but the cited portion of Strahorn has nothing to do with the generation of such information. Neither Strahorn, nor any of the other cited references, discloses a parser computer program with the functionality recited by claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the combination of Jennings, Barrett, Aho, and Strahorn for at least this reason.

Claim 19 recites elements similar to those of claim 1 and is allowable over the applied references for at least similar reasons. Claims 2, 3, 5, 8-13, 16-18, 21, and 23-25 all ultimately depend from either claim 1 or claim 19 and are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of this dependence.

Dependent claims

Dependent claims 2-3, 5, 8-13, 16-18, 21, and 23-25 have all been rejected under § 103(a) being unpatentable over the combination of Jennings, Barrett, Aho, and Strahorn, taken either alone or in combination with other references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Chad E. King/
Chad E. King
Reg. No. 44,187

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
CEK:jep
62155156 v1